

Spring 2-10-1993

Senate Meeting, February 10, 1993

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, February 10, 1993" (1993). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 601.
<http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/601>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUReD@ilstu.edu.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

February 10, 1993

Volume XXIV, No. 9

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of January 27, 1993

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Academic Affairs Committee Proposal for Position Statement on Non-Sexist Language
2. Academic Affairs Committee New Program Request for Major and Minor in Insurance
3. June-December Academic Senate Meeting Calendar

INFORMATION ITEMS:

NONE

Communications

Committee Reports

Adjournment

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussions with the consent of the Senate. Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

(Not Approved by the Academic Senate)

February 10, 1993

Volume XXIV, No. 9

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Len Schmaltz called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:05 p.m. in the Circus Room of the Bone Student Center.

ROLL CALL

Chairperson Len Schmaltz called the roll and declared a quorum present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JANUARY 27, 1993

Senator Walker: I have a correction on page 17, sixth paragraph, second sentence should read: "We asked questions about the input other departments would have on this."

XXIV-47

Motion to approve Academic Senate Minutes of January 27, 1993, by Stock (Second, Stavropoulos) carried on a voice vote.

CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

Chairperson Schmaltz had no remarks.

VICE CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

Vice Chairperson, Matt Shimkus, had no remarks.

SBBD PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

Student Body President, Randy Fox, had no remarks.

ADMINISTRATORS' REMARKS

President Wallace had an excused absence.

Provost Strand read a prepared statement from President Wallace: "On February 1, the administration met with the IBHE staff for the purpose of securing an evaluative report from the IBHE relative to the University's October 1992 submission addressing the IBHE PQP charge given to all public universities. The University

again expressed its concern that since October no response has been received from the IBHE. Although the IBHE had not specified goals for universities to reach in their October report, the executive director and the chairman of the IBHE have both publicly identified institutions for having done a good job. They pointed out the obvious problem of attempting to perform in an acceptable level if goals are not specified. Unfortunately, our attempts to obtain a verbal or written evaluation of the October University response and to obtain a better understanding of the specific, expected outcomes continue to be unsuccessful. This meeting did not produce any clarifications or new understanding for the University with regard to the IBHE staff's expectations. This will make it difficult to ascertain for our October 1993 report how to satisfy the IBHE's request for providing comparable substitutes for the array of programs that they have identified for elimination. We do not know on what basis they have calculated or will calculate the dollar value of programs both parties have identified or will identify for elimination. It remains our intent to pursue through the month of March attempts to satisfy the IBHE's need for a list of programs and activity eliminations and/or dollar reallocations."

Provost Strand: A topic I would like to address this evening is an exercise that is underway at Illinois State University and other public universities in Illinois where we are bracing for significant financial reallocations and employment reductions in the next fiscal year which begins July 1, 1993. The President has been informing campus groups of news concerning the FY94 Budget picture. For example, he has spoken to the President's Advisory Committee, which includes the leadership of the Academic Senate. The causes of the needed budget reallocations and employment reductions include: (1) Continued review of institutional scope of programming here at Illinois State University; (2) The IBHE's Priorities, Quality, and Productivity initiative; and (3) Modest growth projected for next year's budget resulting in insufficient resources to cover unavoidable cost increases for such items as the early retirement benefit payouts, salary adjustments, and utility rate increases. In this exercise, tenure track faculty positions will be protected. More information will be available later this week through the ISU Report, and later this month through the media and an open campus address from President Wallace on this topic.

Senator Walker: The lack of any input from the IBHE -- does this mean that we are truly in limbo and do not know what to expect? How are we going to be able to move forward on our recommendations if we don't know what they will or will not accept.

Provost Strand: There is hopefully going to be some additional dialogue with the IBHE in the next forty-five days. We have been asked by the Board of Regents to prepare an interim report for the March Board of Regents Meeting. Prior to that meeting, there will be a session involving, at a minimum, President Wallace, Dick Wagner, and Rod Groves. President Wallace expressed the hope that there can be some understanding of what the IBHE expects of Illinois State University and other public universities so that this could be discussed in this session, so that we do not find ourselves submitting a report to the Board of Regents in March which is greatly at odds with what the IBHE expects. That is one opportunity for discussion.

Senator Walker: Have they given us any reason why they have not responded?

Provost Strand: They have had sessions with each of the public universities, but because of Dick Wagner's point of view, they have not provided any written analysis. They are preferring to discuss the PQP exercise in these sessions, but are fairly non-specific every time we ask a specific question of them.

Senator White: Provost Strand, can you give us some kind of idea at this point of the magnitude of the FTE's that we are looking at losing?

Provost Strand: I would rather not be specific tonight. I don't know, frankly, what the composite is for the entire university. I know what it is for the academic areas. There will be some information available in this week's ISU Report as I indicated. Once again, repeating, there will not be any tenure track faculty positions cut by this exercise.

Senator White: What is the relationship of this project to the PQP exercise that we have been going through. Are the positions that we are going to be losing going to be a reflection of the work that we have already done in the PQP exercises, or is this going to be something above and beyond that?

Provost Strand: This process relates to the PQP exercise, both year one and year two of the exercise. You will recall that the list that the IBHE prepared pertaining to Illinois State University was much more ambitious than our own submission. We have been told that we could substitute items of comparable scope. Comparable scope was not clearly defined. Then, there have also been statements by the Illinois Board of Higher Education that institutions are expected to reallocate between two and three percent of their budget for the next several years from lower to higher priorities. Faculty/Staff salaries were identified by them as a higher priority. That is just one example. So, there

is a direct relationship to what is happening and the PQP year one and year two exercises.

Senator White: But, what we are talking about now is a new exercise.

Provost Strand: This is in part a response to the year one report and in preparation for the year two report. The year two report is to be submitted October 1, 1993 to the IBHE.

Senator White: But, in the final analysis, it is talking about our focus, and not an across the board kind of reduction.

Provost Strand: That is correct.

Senator Razaki: There are going to be faculty positions eliminated. The tenure track positions are protected, but there are temporary positions that will be eliminated.

Provost Strand: Not necessarily. We are attempting to protect all faculty positions. I have not received reports back from the Deans to know for certain that there will not be any adjustments in the tenure track areas. The exercise is designed to protect all faculty positions, but we are being explicit and specific about tenure track faculty positions.

Senator Razaki: This was done with the input of Department Chairpersons and the College Deans?

Provost Strand: The Deans of the Colleges have each received an assignment from me, and they are engaging in an exercise at the present time. They will be submitting reports to me early next week.

Senator Hesse: You commented that the President intends to keep the faculty and campus informed through the University Report and open meetings, and the media. Do you know the nature of the open meetings that he hopes to have?

Provost Strand: I anticipate that on whatever day there is a most important announcement, that there will be some sort of an open meeting during which members of the faculty and staff will be invited to attend and ask questions or make observations on the exercises. I don't believe at this point that he intends to call a special meeting of the Academic Senate.

Senator Hesse: It would go a long ways with the good will of persons on campus if they learned about things at an open meeting on campus rather than reading about it in the Pantagraph.

Provost Strand: I believe at this point, what the President intends is to have the open campus meeting, followed by a news conference.

Vice President for Student Affairs, William Gurowitz, had no remarks.

Vice President for Business and Finance, James Alexander, had no remarks.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Academic Affairs Committee Proposal for Position Statement on Non-Sexist Language

XXIV-48

Motion by Walker (Second, Pomerence) to approve the Academic Affairs Committee Proposal for Position Statement on Non-Sexist Language and recommend that President Wallace include the position statement in the University Policy Manual, i.e. handbook, as a position statement.

Senator Borg: The question came up at the last meeting about relying upon the National Council of Teachers of English document that makes suggestions for guidelines. What I failed to discuss last week was that included in the selection of references that they used, was the American Psychological Association Document in an article entitled "Guidelines for Non-Sexist Use of Language."

Senator Zeidenstein: I would like to offer an amendment. As a preface, I will cite the following: "Jack and Jill went up the hill to fetch a pail of water. Jack fell down and broke their crown and Jill came tumbling after." Now, I have tried in several ways including visions of Siamese twins coupled at the cranium to make some kind of sense out of that sentence, and I couldn't. Therefore, I would offer the following amendment as a substitute for Guideline 3:

XXIV-49

Zeidenstein Amendment (Second, Razaki)
Avoid generic "he/his" and "she/hers."

Senator Zeidenstein: Very often in many contexts, proper grammar lends clarity of meaning. I hope I illustrated that with the rhyme that I quoted. One other point is that I fight a slightly winning battle with my students' term papers getting parallel construction correct for most of them. I would be in a difficult position to correct peoples' grammar when they have a guideline that says this is the fashionable way to do it, and I say it is grammatically incorrect and I don't know what you are talking about when you use this corrupted grammar.

Senator Hesse: The example that you used is not an example of the generic rule and these do not hold for substituting and vanishing gender pronouns from the language. Generic means when the antecedent is undetermined. In this case, "Jack" is determined. He is the proper antecedent, and this would not have us rewrite a nursery rhyme. I think this is a red herring.

Senator Zeidenstein: I am not going to argue. I have just been enlightened. I didn't know what generic meant in this context. Could you give me an example of a generic he or she.

Senator Hesse: Any students should not be allowed to come. He should be banned from the meeting. That is generic. The student is undetermined. The presumption is that he (the student) is a male. Correction: Students should not be allowed. They should be banned from the meeting. As long as the reference is determined.

Senator Zeidenstein: But, if determined means a noun, itself is not a gender laden noun.

Senator Hesse: No. The English language is not inflected like French or German. Jack is clearly going to have "he" as the pronoun of reference in any document that is grammatically correct.

Senator Zeidenstein: My problem is that I did not know what generic meant in this context. If that is what is meant by the generic "he" or "she," then I don't have a problem.

Senator Razaki: What if you have a girl named "Jack?"

Senator Ritch: I call the previous question. Unanimous consent.

Vote on Zeidenstein amendment failed.

Vote on Position Statement on Non-Sexist Language carried.

2. Academic Affairs Committee New Program Request for Major and Minor in Insurance

XXIV-50

Motion by Walker (Second, Razaki) to approve the Academic Affairs Committee New Program Request for a Major and Minor in Insurance.

Senator Walker: Dr. McGuire is here if we have any questions. We spoke to the proposal at the last Senate meeting. It is a good proposal. We reviewed it from an academic standpoint, and

found that there were no problems with it. What problems we did find were corrected. The Budget Committee looked at it, and Jan Cook can report on that.

Senator Cook: We had a few questions with the original format which were answered by the report that we received from Dr. McGuire. We were satisfied with this proposal as presented as being economically feasible.

Senator Barker: I would ask senators to disregard my proposed amendment. I talked to the chair about the proposal, and he assures me that they will add an addendum to the insurance programs.

Vote on the Major and Minor in Insurance carried.

3. June-December Academic Senate Meeting Calendar

XXIV-51

Motion by Stock (Second, Barker) to approved the June-December Academic Senate Meeting Calendar.

Senator Hoffman: Can this calendar be changed later on in the year.

Chairperson Schmaltz: I suppose the Senate could vote change what they approve. It would probably take a majority vote of the Senate.

Senator Zeidenstein: It might be appropriate, but it would certainly be inconvenient.

Senator Walker: There is a precedent. We have changed the calendar before.

Motion carried on a voice vote.

INFORMATION ITEMS

NONE

COMMUNICATIONS

Senator Razaki: I would like to offer the following Sense of the Senate Resolution:

SENSE OF THE SENATE RESOLUTION - FEBRUARY 10, 1993

Motion by Razaki (Second, Semlak)

The Academic Senate of Illinois State University reaffirms its strong support for the Sense of the Senate resolution passed on February 26, 1992, which urged members of the Illinois State Senate and the House of Representatives to vote to establish a separate board of governors for Illinois State University.

Motion carried on a voice vote with one abstention: Sen. Sims.

Senator Walker: Are we going to send this resolution to legislators?

Chairperson Schmaltz: Yes.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Senator Walker announced that his committee would hold a brief meeting following Senate.

ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Senator White announced that the committee would hold a short meeting after Senate.

BUDGET COMMITTEE - Senator Cook reported that the Budget Committee would meet tonight after Senate adjournment to discuss new data prepared in regard to the Telecommunications proposal. At the last Budget Committee meeting, among other things we discussed an effort to determine the degree to which students are going to be interested in taking summer session classes and the degree to which we will be able to staff summer session classes. One means of attempting to obtain the first data was to persuade the Vidette that this was a question of considerable interest to the population at Illinois State University, to discuss the issue with them, and to ask if they would incorporate a short survey in an issue of the Vidette that could be collected through campus mail so that we could tally the interest of students in summer session courses. I will distribute the draft of that questionnaire for your information.

Senator Walker: You are going to distribute this survey by mail to all students?

Senator Cook: No. Our request was that the Vidette incorporate this as part of a news article relating to the challenge of adequately staffing summer sessions.

Senator Walker: Do you really think that students will respond through the Vidette?

Senator Cook: Sending it by mail would cost more money than the Budget Committee has.

Senator White: How will you know how to interpret your findings? What percentage of students look at the Vidette every day. What percentage of the students that look at the Vidette will fill out a survey and mail it in.

Senator Walker: Is it possible to go through Dean Gurowitz's Department and get better recognition or support for this?

Senator Cook: We have not approached Vice President Gurowitz on this issue. We have discussed the cost of addressing mail to 20,000 students, and decided that that was excessive. The one means of distribution, campuswide, that would not cost that much is the Vidette.

Senator Adams: My question is, would it be more important to know the percentage of students interested in summer school or just the raw numbers of students that are interested. My interpretation would be that the raw numbers would be more important to judge what kind of summer school can be offered. The Vidette would be satisfactory. I think students that are interested in summer school would be motivated enough to send in a survey.

Senator Ken Strand: As I understand the sampling plan right now, I have some fear that the sample will be biased. What about the possibility of attempting to get a much stronger sample? And trying to get a near 100% return on that stronger sample?

Senator Cook: It is my perception that the bias in this case would be that the questionnaire would essentially be returned by those people who are interested in summer school.

Senator Ken Strand: That is an awfully big assumption, I think.

Senator Newgren: One of the problems with crossing and valid crossing is the fact that the level of courses and even the residency during the year varies considerably. An example would be the College of Education which has a large number of students interested in summer school. A lot of those students come from off campus. Any attempt at a sample would be biased.

Senator Cook: To continue my last statement, the numbers that we acquired could be interpreted as only a minimum description of what the demand would be. They would, however, be some clue as

to whether demand is substantively greater than supply. Surely, people who do answer this and say that they would be interested are not all of the people in the state who would be interested in summer school. They do, however, give us some minimum numbers of people who would be interested in summer school. If we discover that that interest is two or three times greater than the number of seats that we will be able to afford to staff, then we will need to address that question seriously.

Senator Razaki: When the Budget Committee discussed this, we were aware of all the possible statistical problems with this type of sampling. The current system does not capture information in terms of when students call in to take a certain course in the summer, they are denied the course because it is not offered or only has a limited number of seats. That information is not currently captured. Another route is to investigate the supply, so we were going to talk to Department Chairpersons, Deans, and Advisors in various colleges, but, they don't keep detailed records. A lot of times students may not even talk to them because certain classes are not being offered. This seemed like the best compromise. We knew that we would get a biased sample, but we would still end up with better information than before.

Senator Fox: I had a couple of comments. First, the minimum numbers, if they were higher than the supply of classes available, then you would have positive results. But if the minimum responses is no where near the actual numbers, then your survey would be null and you would have nothing more than you would have if you had not done the survey at all. I have to disagree. I do not think that students are going to pick up the Vidette and turn in a survey. First, how many students read the Vidette? And then, how many are going to see it? How many are going to take the time to turn it in? If we are going to invest the time to do this, I think we need to do something that is going to prove to be a little more statistically valid. In our office, we have done mail surveys to say one department -- not to 20,000 students, but to just the Sociology Department, for instance. It just seems that there would be ways to do a survey that would be productive, not just something that would give us minimum numbers. I think if we are going to spend the time and money to do it, we need to do it on a greater scale.

Senator Hesse: I thought Senator Adams made a very perceptive comment earlier. I would like to suggest that we have individual departments to determine in their majors what the demand might be for summer enrollments. It would be in the departments very good self interest to turn out a responsive showing. You would have the bias where people pad the ballot boxes, but if they give their social security number, they can't pad them too much.

Senator Cook: It is our intent to approach the department chairs, and also departmental advisors for their perceptions.

Senator Hesse: I think that could be very helpful.

Senator Weber: The professors in a department would draw the attention of the students to the Vidette article, and also I think it would be productive to direct-mail ballots to students who have attended previous summer sessions.

Senator Stavropoulos: I wanted to make a couple of suggestions on the survey. As far as doing it in the Vidette, I think it is a good idea. There are Videttes everywhere. Kids go to class ten minutes early to pick up a Vidette and read it. I think people will go ahead and if they realize that the opportunity of attending summer school is limited, and they can't attend, they will fill it out. A lot of students want to graduate on time. As far as the survey itself, it might be easier to have a scan type survey that students could shade in the circle.

Senator Walker: I have a question for Provost Strand. Are we seriously considering not offering summer school?

Provost Strand: No. The problem, however, is that because of the number of budget adjustments and reallocations that have occurred, the number of dollars available for summer school is greatly reduced. The prognosis that was given was much brighter than the experience in the past. That being the case, what sort of alternate staffing and reimbursement processes and procedures should be examined for classes? We have some departments right now that find that the current method of reimbursing faculty a month's salary for teaching a course is too expensive so they are utilizing graduate assistants and non-tenure track faculty in the summer. For tenure track faculty members, this may be self-defeating. We have other departments that have gone to a stipend type basis. This is a way of examining the demand, the resources, and the method of reimbursing people for summer school.

Senator Nelsen: Senator Walker asked the question that I had. Provost Strand said we were going to offer summer session with the funds that we have available, but need to examine the methods of reimbursement for staffing.

Senator Razaki: Provost Strand, maybe I misread the intentions of this survey when we were talking in the Budget Committee meeting. I thought it was to see which classes we should offer depending upon the demand. I don't see the connection between this survey and the forms of payment that you talked about. I

just want to go on record saying that a number of us are very opposed to any type of stipend for faculty members for summer teaching. Most of the other faculty members in our department have great opposition to this. I would further like to say that if the administration considers stipends for faculty members, it should also consider stipends for the administration.

Senator Ken Strand: Much of this is a response to Senator Razaki's first set of well received comments. It's my understanding that the committee that worked on this survey committed themselves to this task and that they had the advantage of spending a considerable amount of time in its preparation, and the development of a sampling plan. We don't have that same advantage. I do agree that procuring some information is better than procuring none at all. However, I think a different sampling plan would likely give you better information than what the current plan seems to suggest. This is something that has precipitated in the last few minutes in my thinking. This was reinforced by Provost Strand's statement that we will have a summer program. I am wondering then, about the more detailed information in this questionnaire - how that will be utilized as to what kind of courses will be offered.

Senator Cook: The summer schedule is already in print. There is not a question of influencing what classes will appear in the summer schedule. However, a number of those classes are being stipulated by departments as starting with a zero maximum because they do not see the funds available to provide staffing for those classes. If we use the current means of financing summer school within the very limited budget currently available, most of those zero maxes will remain zero. The question is whether we should investigate other means of funding the staffing (not necessarily stipends) -- but there have been other suggestions made in departments as to ways that they could use their limited resources to open more sections. Faculty are not going to be receptive to the idea of changing the way we pay staff, unless they are convinced that there is a significant demand being unmet because of lack of funds. Our question now is not the actual, specific numbers. Our question is whether the rumor that there is a great unmet demand has any substantive basis. We are seeking data from several sources to see whether or not there appears to be significant unmet demand. We did not regard this as a statistical sampling technique. We did not think that in the time available we could generate a valid sampling technique from the diverse population which comes not only from people currently on campus, but many people who are not presently on campus, but come in only for summer. We were seeking the perceptions of advisors, department chairs (which will have to be subjective and relative non-numeric) and what minimum data we could get on minimum levels of interest from this survey.

Senator Ken Strand: I have no problem at all with the need for what you are doing or any of your statements. My questions was if this instrument is disseminated, how will you evaluate the responses? Like the question: "What class(es) would you take if they were available?" There are apparent weaknesses in the sampling plan.

Senator Semlak: We could talk a long time about this survey and the survey technique. I think it is less important to talk about it given that they are looking at all kinds of other things, like past history, discussion with department chairs and advisors, etc. They are really trying to gather some general data. One piece of information that they are going to use as some kind of general monitoring of it all. It sounds like there is a reasonable chance that if there is an excessive demand out there and the Vidette does this and the article indicates that it is important to students, that this survey could have a meaningful response. We have a committee that is assigned to work on this and they have come up with a reasonable way to go. We could debate a better way forever, and given that we don't have very much money to work with, we probably could not implement it anyway.

Senator Hoffmann: When is registration for summer school?

Answer: March.

Senator Hoffmann: When does it end?

Answer: Sometime before the second day of class.

Senator Cook: People who hear that summer school is not available do not attempt to register for it.

Parliamentarian Cohen: People who fail a class do not know that they have failed it yet, either.

Senator Hesse: I think this is just the tip of an iceberg, and I think the Academic Affairs Committee should be consulted at some point about the matter. There are issues of academic quality.

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - No report.

RULES COMMITTEE - Senator Fryda called a short meeting following Senate adjournment.

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Senator Hoffmann asked the chair of Administrative Affairs to repeat what he had said last meeting about the academic calendar.

Senator Curtis White: The fall calendar as it is planned for next year will run its course one time, and then once we have the experience, the committee will know better how it works out. The calendar will not be sent to Administrative Affairs Committee until that has happened. Next year's calendar has already been set.

Senator Hoffmann: Is there any way this could be changed? There is no fall break next year.

Parliamentarian Cohen: The Senate would need a motion to reconsider. It would not be proper when actions already taken have been published.

Senator Harris: What would be the rationale for wanting to change it?

Senator Hoffmann: There is no fall break in the academic calendar. It has been proven that a fall break day is beneficial to students.

ADJOURNMENT

XXIV-53

Motion to adjourn by Zeidenstein (Second, Stock) carried on a voice vote. Academic Senate adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

**FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE
JAN COOK, SECRETARY**

Illinois State University recommends the use of nonsexist language in all official University documents and encourages its use by the faculty, staff, and students in their university-related writing such as course titles and descriptions, syllabi, communications, etc. This position statement acknowledges that there are certain notable exceptions to the attached guidelines, for example, the use of the term freshman.

Rationale:

In 1985 the National Council of Teachers of English approved a revised set of guidelines for nonsexist use of language for its publications. In part their reasoning stated:

Because language plays a central role in the way human beings think and behave, we need to promote language that opens rather than closes possibilities for women and men. Whether teaching in the classroom, assigning texts, determining curriculum, serving on national committees, or writing official documents, university professors and personnel directly and indirectly influence thought and behavior....The role of education is to make choices available, not to limit opportunities. Censorship removes possibilities; [the following guidelines] extend what is available by offering alternatives to traditional usages and to editorial choices that restrict meaning.¹

The ISU position statement reflects both the university's acknowledgement of the value of non-restrictive language as well as its awareness that such may be accomplished without sacrificing good writing.

Guidelines²:

1. Avoid the generic "man" because "the word man has come to refer almost exclusively to adult males;" instead, use humanity, human beings, people.
2. Use the same titles for women and men when naming jobs. For examples, chair, coordinator, moderator, head, chairperson, instead of chairman or chairwomen; firefighter instead of fireman; police officer instead of policeman.
3. Avoid generic "he" and "his" by substituting the plural, omitting the possessive (his) or substituting an article for it, substituting first or second person for third, recasting in the passive voice, or sparingly using he or she and his or her.
4. Identify men and women in the same way. For examples, actor...she (not actress), doctor...she (not lady doctor), lawyer...she (not lady lawyer), poet (not poetess), Joyce, Gide and Woolf (not Joyce, Gide and Virginia Woolf).
5. Seek alternatives to language that patronizes or trivializes women. For examples, assistant (not Gal Friday), women from the office (not girls from the office), big job (not man-sized job).

Other more specific recommendations are available in the NCTE publication from which these examples are borrowed.

¹Guidelines for Nonsexist Use of Language in NCTE Publications (Revised, 1985).

²freely adapted from Guidelines for Nonsexist Use of Language in NCTE Publications (Revised, 1985).

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING CALENDAR

JUNE - DECEMBER, 1993

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

HOVEY 419
4:00 P.M.

June 1, 1993

June 28, 1993

August 16, 1993

August 30, 1993

September 20, 1993

October 4, 1993

October 18, 1993

November 1, 1993

November 29, 1993

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETINGS

CIRCUS ROOM - 7:00 P.M.
BONE STUDENT CENTER

*June 9, 1993

*July 7, 1993

August 25, 1993

September 8, 1993

September 29, 1993

October 13, 1993

October 27, 1993

November 10, 1993

December 8, 1993
(OLD MAIN ROOM)

*Subject to Call

FEB 2 - 1993

TO: Academic Senate
FROM: Senator Barker *AB*
RE: Amendment of New Program Request for Major in Insurance
DATE: February 2, 1993

When the Program Request was on the table as an information item at the last Academic Senate meeting I expressed my concern with its statement under Planning Priority Three (page 4). I felt the second paragraph was vague and needed further clarification. Therefore I propose the following amended paragraph.

The College of Business is currently negotiating with Aetna Insurance and State Farm Insurance to obtain a combined grant of \$200,000. This money will be used to support education enrichment programs for academically talented minority students from the Chicago area. This program will also be expanded to the down-state area in the future as funds permit.

The word minority was added for clarification. The last sentence was added so that the university focuses on its down-state population as well. Should State Farm Insurance decide to provide funding it would seem foolish not to include minority students in the down-state area from where State Farm is based.

I believe these changes in the second paragraph of Planning Priority Three are valid.

2293.1